

AGENDA
Regular Meeting of the Governing Body of the
Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority

Alameda City Hall
Council Chamber, Room 390
2263 Santa Clara Avenue
Alameda, CA 94501

Wednesday, December 7, 2005
Meeting will begin at 7:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted, approved or adopted by one motion unless a request for removal for discussion or explanation is received from the Board or a member of the public.

2-A. Approval of the minutes of the Special Meeting of December 16 , 2004.

2-B. Approval of the minutes of the Special Meeting of May 12, 2005.

2-C. Approval of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 1, 2005.

3. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

3-A. Presentation of Revised Alameda Point Preliminary Development Concept (PDC).

4. ORAL REPORTS

4-A. Oral report from Member Matarrese, RAB representative.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA (PUBLIC COMMENT)

(Any person may address the governing body in regard to any matter over which the governing body has jurisdiction that is not on the agenda.)

6. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE GOVERNING BODY

7. ADJOURNMENT

This meeting will be cablecast live on channel 15. The next regular ARRA meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 4, 2006.

Notes:

- Sign language interpreters will be available on request. Please contact the ARRA Secretary at 749-5800 at least 72 hours before the meeting to request an interpreter.
- Accessible seating for persons with disabilities (including those using wheelchairs) is available.
- Minutes of the meeting are available in enlarged print.
- Audio tapes of the meeting are available for review at the ARRA offices upon request.

UNAPPROVED
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
ALAMEDA REUSE AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

2-A

Wednesday, December 16, 2004

The meeting convened at 5:50 p.m. with Mayor Johnson presiding.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Beverly Johnson, Mayor, City of Alameda
Tony Daysog, Vice Mayor, City of Alameda
Barbara Kerr, Boardmember, City of Alameda
Frank Matarrese, Boardmember, City of Alameda
Marie Gilmore, Boardmember, City of Alameda

Absent: None.

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

2-A. Recommendation to approve a Contract Amendment with ROMA Design Group for Transit Planning Services at Alameda Point in the amount of \$100,000.

Member Matarrese motioned for approval of the Consent Calendar item. The motion was seconded by Member Daysog and passed by the following voice vote: Ayes – 5; Noes – 0; Abstentions – 0.

Mayor Johnson advised that Item 4-B would be called before Item 3.

3. PRESENTATION

3-A. Presentation/update on Alameda Point Navy Negotiations and Land Use Planning.

Stephen Proud, Project Manager, displayed a presentation and noted that they had a fairly productive meeting the Navy in the beginning of December. The Navy presented an overview of the process related to the historic district, and a draft timeline. One of the main obligations in the MOA is to begin the process of nominating the historic district at Alameda Point for registration in the National Register of Historic Places. The Navy would like to renegotiate their MOA, to bring it current with the State Office of Historic Preservation and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation requirements.

The Navy provided an environmental update regarding the status and timing of remedial actions at OU-1, which the City was particularly interested in. Mr. Proud noted that they held a brief update on the economic analysis and identified the outstanding issues for resolution.

In response to an inquiry by Member Kerr whether the Navy had begun to appreciate the value of Alameda Point, Mr. Proud replied that was starting to happen. The City had spent considerable

time educating the Navy about the value of the site and adaptive reuse of the buildings, especially in bringing the buildings to a leasable/saleable condition. Weekly meetings with ROMA continued, working through the phasing plan, and finalizing infrastructure and environmental remediation cost estimates. The second community workshop was held at the Mastick Senior Center on December 2, 2004, and was very well-attended (190 people). The City was ready to commence a serious and deeper transportation analysis for Alameda Point, including presenting the range of long-term regional transit opportunities, such as BART stations, light rail and an aerial tram. The public comment at this meeting was very valuable, and would be passed along to the ARRA members.

Andrew Thomas, Planning Department, stated that the plan for the next workshop was February 28, 2005, hosted by the Planning Board so it may be broadcast.

Vice Mayor Daysog advised he had received several emails concerning Measure A, and their sense that staff had been muzzled from discussing it. Measure A was a charter of the City, and he believed frank and open discussions of Measure A should be held. He wanted to assure the public there was no attempt to suppress that discussion.

In response to Member Matarrese's question regarding the Wildlife Refuge, Mr. Proud replied that the Navy received a letter from the Veteran's Administration expressing interest in the property currently slated to go to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and that they had sent a short response.

The public hearing was open for discussion.

There were several speakers from the community who discussed concerns regarding Measure A, including Irene Dieter, Jonathan Sagwin, Robert Siltan, Lowell Solomon, Michael Krueger, John Roulrier and Jean Sweeney. Discussion included concerns about an Amended Measure A scenario and transit-friendly alternatives that includes multifamily housing.

The public hearing was closed for Authority discussion.

Member Kerr noted that the traffic from Atlantic Avenue was already turning left onto Sherman, and not Buena Vista Avenue; that traffic had a negative impact on the Sherman residents. She was very concerned about the effect that development on Alameda Point would have on the rest of the Island's streets.

Member Matarrese noted that the key point was the ability to move people around the Island, and that the density was not so much the issue as the number of cars.

4. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

4-A. Report and recommendation regarding the continuing roles and responsibilities of the APAC (requested by Boardmember Kerr).

Chair Lee Perez presented this report.

Member Matarrese motioned that the APAC continue until the final AP Community Workshop in June 2005. The motion was seconded by Member Kerr and passed by the following voice vote: Ayes – 4; Noes – 0; Abstentions – 1 (Member Daysog).

4-B. Recommendation from the Executive Director to Revise ARRA Leasing Policies and Procedures.

Nanette Banks, Development Services Department, presented a follow-up to the previous month's inquiry regarding the leasing policies and procedures.

John McManus, Cushman & Wakefield, provided background of the leasing market. Ms. Banks noted that leases that are over seven years are currently brought to the ARRA; they proposed revising that lease length to two years, and that it would be tied to when the developer is expected to receive the property in approximately 2006. They proposed bringing anything greater than a two-year lease to the ARRA for approval. Licenses are the shorter term special events, and will continue to be approved administratively.

Theresa Highsmith, Assistant City Attorney, stated the original resolution to delegated power inherent in the ARRA Board to the Executive Director to review all leases with terms of seven years or less; anything else came to the ARRA Board. If the Executive Director had a lease less than seven years that was under the authority delegated to him by the ARRA Board, he could still have brought it before the ARRA Board. Consistent with the staff recommendation, a resolution was prepared within the packet that would send anything that was two years or over to the ARRA Board, as well as anything that suggested QSI above 10% of the annual rent.

Member Kerr approved of a tighter form of review from the ARRA Board.

Vice Mayor Daysog stated he served as an alternate to the Oakland Base Reuse Authority for 3 years discussed their monthly report procedures.

In response to an inquiry by Mayor Johnson regarding payment of rents, Ms. Banks confirmed that most of the tenants were current; and noted that the Hornet, Edge Innovations and Marad were the three tenants who are in arrears; however, the timing of the Marads payments put them on the arrears list. Edge Innovations is in the process of restructuring their payments, and had recently lost several large film contracts.

The public hearing was open for discussion.

Bill Smith noted that he had met with the Mayor of Beijing, had been misquoted, and had discussed electric bicycle technology with him.

The public hearing was closed for Authority discussion.

Members Matarrese and Gilmore discussed the amount of leases per month were to be signed/renewed and requested they come back on a monthly basis for approval. Member Matarrese noted that the rationale was so the Council could have an idea of the leasing landscape

as the date of conveyance draws closer, and so the public would know what the status of the buildings was. Member Kerr believed the leasing information should be available to the public.

Member Matarrese motioned for a monthly summary report of all leases for Alameda Point be brought to ARRA for review and approval by the leasing staff. The motion was seconded by Member Daysog and passed by the following voice vote: Ayes – 5; Noes – 0; Abstentions – 0.

5. ORAL REPORTS

5-A. Oral report from APAC. (Presented in Item 4-A)

5-B. Oral report from Member Matarrese, RAB representative.

Member Matarrese gave a brief overview of the last RAB meeting on Dec. 2nd.

6. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA (PUBLIC COMMENT)

7. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE GOVERNING BODY

8. ADJOURNMENT TO CLOSED SESSION OF THE ARRA TO CONSIDER CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR:

8-A. Property: Alameda Naval Air Station
Negotiating parties: ARRA, Navy, and Alameda Point Community Partners
Under negotiation: Price and Terms

Announcement of Action Taken in Closed Session, if any.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Johnson adjourned the open session meeting at 8:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Irma Glidden
ARRA Secretary

**UNAPPROVED
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ALAMEDA REUSE AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

Thursday, May 12, 2005

2-B

The meeting convened at 7:35 p.m. with Chair Johnson presiding.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Beverly Johnson, Chair, City of Alameda
Doug DeHaan, Boardmember, City of Alameda
Tony Daysog, Boardmember, City of Alameda
Marie Gilmore, Boardmember, City of Alameda
Frank Mataresse, Boardmember, City of Alameda

2. Public Comment on Agenda Items Only.

One speaker slip from Helen Sause, however she was not present.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

None.

4. PRESENTATION

4-A. Presentation/Update on Alameda Point Navy Negotiations and Land Use Planning.

Stephen Proud briefed the Board on two different fronts: 1) the Navy conveyance process, and 2) the land planning effort. A proposal has been submitted to the Navy - they wrote a counter proposal that we responded to which is under consideration right now with them. We're hoping to have an official response from the Navy by the end of June and that coincides with Alameda Community Partners election to proceed timeline.

Mr. Proud gave a brief overview of the May 7, 2005 Community Meeting, commenting that staff is pleased with the community's continued participation in the planning process and there was a lot of good feedback. The next community workshop is June 8th at Mastick. The next step would be to come back to the ARRA board with a copy of the preliminary development concept for the regular July ARRA meeting.

Member Mataresse requested that a section be included that has a summary of compliance with the General Plan amendment, compliance with the Economic Development Strategic plan and compliance with other relevant plans, for that preliminary development concept that will be coming back in July.

5. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

5-A. Provide Direction to the Acting Executive Director regarding the term of the lease extension for Building 613 Sublease Agreement between the ARRA and Alameda Point Collaborative.

Debbie Potter requested direction on a sublease between the ARRA and APC for building 13 which is currently being used as an office to house the Red Cross. She gave a brief history of the lease and requested extension thru Dec 31, 2006 so that it coincides with the overall development plan for Alameda Point. Several representatives from APC spoke in support of a lease extension until 2012, including Doug Biggs and Jim Franz.

In response to Member Matarrese regarding the time frame for development of that parcel, Bill Norton replied that plans are for the Navy to turn that property over to the City at the end of 2006. Stephen Proud, Alameda Point Project Manager, also noted that if we reach an agreement with the Navy and the developer at the end of 2006, infrastructure and geotechnical work would start in 2007

After discussion from Boardmembers regarding the timing of development, Chair Johnson advised that it would make more sense to have the shorter term now and consider a longer term when we know more at the end of Dec 2006, supporting staff recommendation.

Staff recommendation accepted and passed by the following voice vote: Ayes-5; Noes-0 Abstentions-0

5-B. Study Session of the FY 2005-06 ARRA Budget

Bill Norton, acting Executive Director, introduced this item with an overview of Part 1 of the Budget Study Session. Leslie Little, Development Services Director, presented Part 2 - a summary of the FY 2005-06 ARRA Budget - by walking the Board through the staff report. She discussed overriding issues: the pro forma and the development assumptions at Alameda Point. Member DeHaan raised the question regarding \$1.8M that should be absorbed back into the general fund. Bill Norton confirmed Member DeHaan's comments and advised the Board of a new proposed budget for 05-06 for all city funds, including the general fund, noting that revenues for different departments are down and we have accounted for this in our budget for the next fiscal year.

There was brief discussion about the storage of surplus equipment the Navy left for the City. Leslie noted some plans for the surplus equipment, including an auction to raise funds. She then discussed the organizational structure for the Development Services Department, namely the Base Reuse and Redevelopment Division – where 4 staff members are paid from the ARRA Budget. Leslie discussed Building One tenants: Development occupies the entire 2nd floor; the Alameda Development Corporation which maintains a 2nd floor office; and a storage room for the Navy's records. Public Works, Fire Prevention and Information Technology occupy the first floor and balance of the building.

Leslie discussed the employee positions and vacancies in the department and how they fit together with the three budget categories: Community Development, ARRA, and the CIC. Municipal Services funding was noted in length, with Member Daysog requesting a separate report/background information on the mitigation fund.

Bill Norton advised that there are still negotiations with the developer upcoming and if the developer exercises their notice to proceed, they will make direct cost recovery payments, until we have a disposition and development agreement, to DSD and the general fund.

Member Matarrese advised that we have to be prepared for the developer not exercising their right to proceed, and that if we are able to segregate general fund obligations from ARRA fund obligations, that would be the foundation for making a decision on anything less than the best case scenario. Leslie Little concluded her presentation.

6. ORAL REPORTS

6-A. Oral report from APAC.

There were no representatives from the APAC to give a report.

6-B. Oral report from Member Matarrese, RAB representative.

Member Matarrese gave a brief overview of the last RAB meeting he attended.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA (PUBLIC COMMENT)

(Any person may address the governing body in regard to any matter over which the governing body has jurisdiction that is not on the agenda.)

8. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE GOVERNING BODY

9. ADJOURNMENT TO CLOSED SESSION OF THE ARRA TO CONSIDER:

9-A. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR:

Property:	Alameda Naval Air Station
Negotiating parties:	ARRA, U.S. Navy, and Alameda Point Community Partners
Under negotiation:	Price and Terms

9-B. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR:


Property:	Alameda Naval Air Station
Negotiating parties:	ARRA and U.S. Navy
Under negotiation:	Price and Terms

Announcement of Action Taken in Closed Session, if any.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 9:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Irma Glidden". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Irma Glidden
ARRA Secretary

**UNAPPROVED
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ALAMEDA REUSE AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

Wednesday, June 1, 2005

The meeting convened at 7:35 p.m. with Chair Johnson presiding.

2-C

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Beverly Johnson, Chair, City of Alameda
Tony Daysog, Boardmember, City of Alameda
Doug DeHaan, Boardmember, City of Alameda
Frank Matarrese, Boardmember, City of Alameda
Marie Gilmore, Boardmember, City of Alameda

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

2-A Report from the Acting Executive Director recommending the Approval of Subleases at Alameda Point.

**Member Matarrese motioned for approval of the Consent Calendar items. The motion was seconded by Chair Johnson and passed by the following voice vote:
Ayes – 5; Noes – 0; Abstentions – 0.**

3. PRESENTATION

3-A. Presentation/update on Alameda Point Navy Negotiations and Land Use Planning

Steven Proud, project manager for Alameda Point, gave a brief update on Navy Negotiations, focused on two fronts: submission of the conveyance proposal to the Navy; and the public planning process. The conveyance proposal was submitted to the Navy in May and is under consideration by the Navy right now. There have been meetings in support of that with some of the regulatory agencies, including the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and EPA. The next meeting with the Navy to discuss the contents of the proposal is June 2, 2005. Mr. Proud reminded the public and the Board that the next public workshop is on June 8th at the Mastick Senior Center, starting at 6:30PM.

Chair Johnson thanked Mr. Proud and commented on all the positive feedback she's received from the public regarding the workshops: that they appreciate all the hard work and effort and how informative and helpful the presentations were.

Mr. Proud gave credit to Andrew Thomas, Planning Supervisor, for coordinating the workshops, and to Irma Frankel for coordinating the public outreach, and other staff members who have worked hard to make sure the workshops are successful.

Member deHaan asked when we're expecting the Navy to respond. Mr. Proud stated that we asked for a response from the Navy by June 30th, which corresponds to the date in the conditional acquisition agreement with Alameda Point Community Partners for their election to proceed.

3-B. Video presentation by the Alameda Naval Air Museum (ANAM).

Marilyn York from the Alameda Naval Museum gave a brief (4 minutes) video presentation of the Alameda Naval Air Museum (ANAM).

Marilyn York and Barbara Bach were two public speakers, both requesting a long term lease with the right of renewal and the same terms for the ANAM.

Member deHaan thanked them for the effort they put in it and remarked that the video was extremely informative. He commended them for the effort to get the shell improvements which were over \$700,000.

4. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

- 4-A. Report authorizing the Acting Executive Director to Execute a two year lease renewal (1-year with 1-year owner option) with Alameda Naval Air Museum (ANAM) for Building 77 at Alameda Point.

In response to Member deHaan's question regarding why the agreement is in front of the Board if it's already been signed, Bill Norton explained that the agreement has not been signed by the museum association, as they indicated they want at least a 5 year and probably a 20 year lease. So they have not signed it. Mr. Norton further explained that the ANAM did have a 5 year lease. However, there were performance criteria in the lease, but they did not have the ability to perform over a 3 year period because they did not have time to actually occupy the structure until they got a certificate of occupancy in March 2004, it's not reasonable to expect them evaluated on the performance measure that they were required to. The original thought was to give them this prior year plus 2 years upcoming, so that we could review the performance criteria during that period of time. Mr. Norton advised, based upon some of the concerns that ANAM has, to modify the item to authorize the Executive Director to enter into negotiations with ANAM for the lease, rather than authorizing the existing lease agreement to be signed – enter into negotiations for a new lease.

There were several speakers, including the representative from Red Bridge Media, Ken Robles, who is partnered with Veterans Administration Archival Department in Washington, D.C. in a historical video project (video taping veterans) to keep the history alive.

Member Matarrese motioned for staff's recommendation to enter into negotiations for a new lease with ANAM. The motion was seconded by Member Gilmore and passed by the following voice vote: Ayes – 5; Noes – 0; Abstentions – 0.

5. ORAL REPORTS

5-A Oral report from APAC.

Chair Lee Perez was not present and the ARRA Secretary read written comments from Helen Sause regarding her concerns on the redevelopment of Alameda Point. Chair Johnson advised that it was unclear whether Ms. Sause's written note were drafted with Lee Perez as the APAC oral report, or if she intended them to be just public comment.

5-B. Oral report from Member Matarrese, RAB representative.

Member Matarrese said he would have two RAB at the July 14th ARRA meeting.

6. ORAL COMMUNICAITONS, NON-AGENDA (PUBLIC COMMENT)

(Any person may address the governing body in regard to any matter over which the governing body has jurisdiction that is not on the agenda.)

There was one speaker slip, Virginia Roberts, who supports Helen Sause's comments regarding appointing a citizens committee to assist with the Alameda Point redevelopment.

Chair Johnson noted that public involvement is always encouraged and would like people to continue to participate in the process.

7. COMMUNICAITONS FROM THE GOVERNING BODY

There was no additional communications from the Board.

8. ADJOURNMENT TO CLOSED SESSION OF THE ARRA TO CONSIDER CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR:

Chair Johnson advised that this item was a place holder in case it was needed, but that there was no item to discuss.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 9:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Irma Glidden
ARRA Secretary

Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority
Interoffice Memorandum

3-A

November 9, 2005

To: Honorable Chair and Members of the
Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority

From: Debra Kurita, Executive Director

Re: Presentation of Revised Alameda Point Preliminary Development Concept

Background

In December 2003, the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority (ARRA) entered into a Conditional Acquisition Agreement (CAA) with Alameda Point Community Partners (APCP) that initiated an 18-month pre-development effort to prepare a Preliminary Development Concept (PDC) for Alameda Point. Pursuant to the CAA, the PDC should provide: *“a conceptual development program that conforms to the physical, economic, and environmental constraints of NAS Alameda, including the Project Site, and also fulfills the public goals for development of the Project Site which are set forth in the Alameda General Plan and the Alameda Point Reuse Plan.”*

In January 2004, staff began developing a public engagement strategy and hiring a qualified consultant team. With the assistance of the ARRA, the Alameda Point Advisory Committee, and the Planning Board, staff began work on the PDC in the spring of 2004. For the next year, the staff/consultant team worked closely with the Alameda community and the City Boards and Commissions to prepare the PDC. A series of well-attended public workshops and numerous Board and Commission meetings provided the community with a variety of venues to comment on the full range of issues relevant to the PDC, including, but not limited to: public policy objectives, environmental constraints, regulatory constraints, including Measure A, alternative land use programs, historic preservation options, financial trade-offs, and alternative transportation strategies.

On July 14, 2005, staff presented the first draft of the PDC to the ARRA Board. Based upon comments received at the meeting, staff made a series of revisions to the PDC. Those changes were presented to the ARRA on October 5, 2005. At that time, the ARRA requested a number of additional changes to the document.

The “December Text Only Draft PDC”, provided under separate cover, highlights the revisions made to the PDC in response to the comments received in July and October. The remainder of this report describes the major changes to the PDC. This report concludes with a recommendation that the ARRA approve the text changes and direct staff to prepare a final version of the PDC, with the graphics and appropriate formatting, for acceptance by the ARRA at a future meeting.

Similar to the community outreach for the July and October ARRA meetings, staff provided an e-mail notice to 250 Alameda residents and businesses notifying them of the most recent changes to the PDC, which are provided on the website, and of the December ARRA meeting.

Discussion

At its July and October meetings, the ARRA directed staff to make a number of changes to the PDC. The changes are summarized below and are included in detail in the attached Text Only PDC.

A Planning Study: The PDC title and Executive Summary were revised to clarify that the PDC is a planning study and that acceptance of the PDC by the ARRA has no legally binding effect on future actions by the ARRA or the City of Alameda. The PDC includes a conceptual site plan, development program, and transportation plan that show how the 1996 Community Reuse Plan and 2003 Alameda Point General Plan policies may be implemented within the significant environmental, institutional, financial and contractual constraints that exist at Alameda Point. At the ARRA's request, the term "feasibility" was removed to emphasize that the PDC is a planning study examining opportunities and constraints that currently exist at the site and that any change to these opportunities or constraints might allow for changes to the land use pattern or transportation strategies recommended in the PDC. Over time, as conditions change, it is likely that the type, intensity, and arrangement of land uses shown in the PDC's illustrative plans may change. As portions of the former naval facility become available for redevelopment, changing economic conditions, new community priorities, new regulations and standards, and/or different financing or development strategies may require consideration of different land use plans.

The PDC is an informational document to be used by the Alameda community as a tool to promote discussion and evaluation of the type and intensity of development that is appropriate or necessary at Alameda Point. Consideration of alternate development plans is not precluded or discouraged by ARRA acceptance of the PDC. The PDC is intended to facilitate exploration and consideration of financially feasible development alternatives that implement public policy objectives within the constraints at Alameda Point. To facilitate public evaluation and discussion, the PDC focuses on some of the important compromises and trade-offs that will be necessary to accommodate a financially feasible redevelopment program. By highlighting some of the difficult compromises that may be necessary given the financial and environmental constraints, the PDC identifies issues that will require additional work with the community as part of the entitlement process for Alameda Point.

A Mixed Use Plan: At the ARRA meetings, a concern was raised that the PDC must be a balanced plan with a well articulated vision for both the non-residential and residential areas.

The Executive Summary and Land Use Chapter were revised to emphasize that Alameda Point will be a mixed-use development with both jobs and housing. The revisions clarify that Alameda Point will include a wide variety of non-residential uses including warehousing, industrial, maritime industrial, outdoor work and/or corporation yards, manufacturing, office, research and development, and retail/commercial uses. The employment areas in the PDC will generate approximately 9,000 jobs or approximately 4.5 jobs for every housing unit at Alameda Point. These jobs will improve the City's jobs-housing balance and further support the transportation strategy for Alameda Point. On-site job opportunities help to reduce traffic generated by the residential development, and these additional job opportunities may reduce the number of existing Alameda residents who are currently

commuting off-island for employment.

The Illustrative Plan (Figure 18) was revised to include non-residential building footprints on all of the non-residential parcels. This change helps to emphasize the location and scale of the proposed non-residential uses. It also highlights the critical interface between residential and non-residential development. This interface will require careful planning and design by the City and the development community to ensure that these different land uses co-exist without conflict to create the successful mixed-use community envisioned in the General Plan.

To assist in the planning of commercial and residential interfaces, the Framework Chapter was revised to include a brief description and map of the proposed truck routes at Alameda Point. The map helps to highlight that the non-residential areas will need to be served by trucks and that certain residential areas will be adjacent to designated truck routes. Although the truck routes are conceptual, it will be important to designate a final set of routes prior to construction and occupancy of the potentially affected residential areas.

Finally, with the recent court decision upholding the City's Work/Live Ordinance for the Northern Waterfront, it is worth noting that the PDC recommends that the City develop a Work/Live Ordinance for Alameda Point to facilitate the mixed use of buildings and the reuse of existing historic structures.

Sustainable, Energy Efficient Design: The Executive Summary, Land Use Chapter, and Next Steps Chapter were amended to emphasize that development at Alameda Point will be designed to minimize the impacts of reuse and redevelopment on the environment and will encourage the use of energy efficient, green building, and sustainable design principles.

Sports Center: The Introduction Chapter was revised to clarify that the Sports Center layout shown in the PDC is a conceptual layout that may change as project funding becomes available and final design plans are prepared.

Phasing Plan: The Land Use Chapter was revised to clarify that the anticipated phasing program is preliminary and could change due to the Navy's conveyance schedule, the remediation schedule, and changes in market conditions.

Civic and Community Uses: The Land Use Chapter was revised to clarify that community facilities such as child care centers, places of worship and senior centers will be allowed and encouraged throughout Alameda Point. The revisions highlight General Plan policies supporting these uses and a number of specific buildings that are being preserved that may be used for these purposes, including the chapel, theatre, O'Club, and the BEQ Mess Hall.

Measure A Alternative: The Next Steps Chapter was revised to describe in more detail how a "non-Measure A" alternative will be analyzed during the environmental review process for a final Master Plan and Phase I entitlements.

Historic Preservation Studies: The Next Steps Chapter was revised to describe the scope of the adaptive reuse study that will be conducted during the environmental review process.

School Facilities: Based on meetings with AUSD representatives, the Next Steps Chapter was revised to include a description of the school facilities needs analysis that will be completed by AUSD.

Zoning and Infrastructure: The Next Steps Chapter was revised to include a brief discussion of the next steps that will be necessary to prepare a comprehensive rezoning of Alameda Point and finalize the infrastructure plan.

Transportation: The Next Steps Chapter was revised to identify the steps necessary to implement a transportation strategy that is environmentally sensitive and addresses the needs of both residents and employees at Alameda Point.

Appendix A: Transportation Strategy: The transportation strategy was revised and expanded to include additional information about the transit alternatives evaluation and the traffic studies that form the basis for the recommended transportation and roadway network. The document was also revised to include the text regarding electric buses, potential partnerships with Alameda Power and Telecom, and strategies to reduce non-residential traffic.

Appendix D: General Plan Consistency: This appendix was deleted because the PDC is a conceptual plan and a future development plan may differ from the conceptual PDC. Therefore, the scope of the General Plan amendments that will be necessary may also change. For information purposes, the October staff report included a consistency analysis of the PDC with the General Plan.

Appendix E: Financial Feasibility and Fiscal Neutrality: Appendix E was modified to include additional information about the project economics for each phase and the full build-out condition. In addition, the changes clarified some questions regarding property taxes, transfer taxes, and tax increment generated by the project.

Environmental Determination

Acceptance of the PDC by the ARRA is an action that is statutorily exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15262 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines. Section 15262 states that an action to approve or accept a planning study for possible future actions which the ARRA has not approved, adopted, or funded does not require the preparation of an EIR or Negative Declaration.

Fiscal Impact

Consideration of the revised Alameda Point PDC has no fiscal impact.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the ARRA Board approve the proposed revisions and direct staff to prepare a final Preliminary Development Concept for ARRA acceptance at a future meeting.

Respectfully submitted,



Leslie A. Little

Development Services Director



Stephen Proud

Alameda Point Project Manager



By: Andrew Thomas
Supervising Planner

On file in the City Clerk's office:

- A. December Text Only Draft PDC
- B. Appendix A: Transportation Strategy
- C. Appendix E: Financial Feasibility and Fiscal Neutrality